

Appl. No. 10/812,128
Amdt. dated December 15, 2005
Reply to Office action of September 21, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the Office action dated September 21, 2005, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roscoe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,498,731) in view of Wallace et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,628,537).

With this Response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 14, and 22 and canceled claims 4 and 16.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 14, and 22 to more particularly claim the arrangement of components when the memory package is in a closed position. Claim 1 has been amended to include that, when the cover portions are in a closed position, the electronics sub-assemblies are nested such that the memory module sockets mounted to the first circuit board are adjacent to the controller chip mounted to the second circuit board and the memory module sockets mounted to the second circuit board are adjacent to the controller chip of the first circuit board. Claims 14 and 22 have also been amended to include similar limitations.

The Examiner relies on Roscoe to teach an electronic assembly having a memory module socket, or memory module, mounted to a circuit board supported by a cover portion. The Examiner concedes that Roscoe does not teach a controller chip and relies on Wallace to teach a controller chip disposed on the circuit board. There are no teachings in either Roscoe or Wallace that teach the arrangement of components that is claimed. The Examiner has not cited any other teachings or motivation for making claimed arrangement.

Claims 1, 14, and 22 have been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations previously found in now cancelled claims 4 and 16. In rejecting claims 4 and 16, the Examiner relied solely on Roscoe to teach the limitations as to the arrangement of the memory modules, or memory module sockets, in relationship to the memory controller chips. Because the Examiner has conceded that Roscoe does not teach a memory controller chip, Roscoe can not

Appl. No. 10/812,128
Amdt. dated December 15, 2005
Reply to Office action of September 21, 2005

teach the relationship between the memory modules, or the memory module sockets, and the memory controller chip.

Further, even if Roscoe did teach a memory controller chip, Roscoe does not teach the particular arrangement of components that is claimed. "The mere fact that a worker in the art could rearrange the parts of the reference device to meet the terms of the claims on appeal is not by itself sufficient to support a finding of obviousness. The prior art must provide a motivation or reason for the worker in the art, without the benefit of appellant's specification, to make the necessary changes in the reference device." *Ex parte Chicago Rawhide Mfg. Co.*, 223 USPQ 351, 353 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1984). MPEP 2144.04(VI)(C).

Absent the Applicants' specification, there is no motivation to arrange components as claimed in claims 1, 14, and 22. Therefore, claims 1, 14, and 22 are not rendered obvious by the cited combination. The remainder of the pending claims depend from one of claims 1, 14, or 22 and are also not rendered obvious by the cited combination. Therefore, claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-24 are allowable over the cited art.

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are

Appl. No. 10/812,128
Amdt. dated December 15, 2005
Reply to Office action of September 21, 2005

hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Derek V. Forinash
PTO Reg. No. 47,231
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400